

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

BEFORE THE
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

COUNTIES OF SOUTHERN ILLINOIS) DOCKET NO.
) 12-0094
)
Petition for Authority to Operate)
a Regional Next Generation 9-1-1)
Pilot Project System.)

Springfield, Illinois
Wednesday, October 10, 2012

Met, pursuant to notice, at 9:00 a.m.
BEFORE:
MR. JOHN ALBERS, Administrative Law Judge
MS. JANIS VON QUALEN, Administrative Law Judge

APPEARANCES:

MS. KELLY A. ARMSTRONG
Office of General Counsel
Illinois Commerce Commission
160 North LaSalle Street, Suite C-800
Chicago, Illinois 60601-3104

(Appearing via teleconference on
behalf of Staff witnesses of the
Illinois Commerce Commission)

L. A. COURT REPORTERS
By: Carla J. Boehl, Reporter
CSR #084-002710

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2 MR. JOHN H. KELLY

3 OTTOSEN BRITZ KELLY COOPER GILBERT & DINOLFO,
LTD.

4 1804 North Naper Boulevard, Suite 350
Naperville, Illinois 60563

5 (Appearing via teleconference on
6 behalf of Counties of Southern
Illinois)

7 MR. RICHARD W. HIRD

PETEFISH IMMEL HEEB & HIRD, LLP

8 842 Louisiana Street
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

9

(Appearing on behalf of the
10 NG-911, Inc.)

11 MS. NANCY J. HERTEL

General Attorney

12 Illinois Bell Telephone Company
225 West Randolph Street, Room 25D
13 Chicago, Illinois 60606

14 (Appearing via teleconference on
behalf of Illinois Bell
15 Telephone Company)

16 MR. PATRICK J. LUSTIG

Project Manager

17 303 North Robinson Circle
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

18

(Appearing on behalf of the
19 Counties of Southern Illinois)

20

21

22

1 APPEARANCES: (Continued)

2 MR. KENNETH E. SMITH

Chairman

3 300 North Park Avenue

Herrin, Illinois 62948

4

(Appearing on behalf of the

5 Counties of Southern Illinois)

6 LIEUTENANT TRACY FELTY

Harris County 911

7 One North Main

Harrisburg, Illinois 62946

8

(Appearing via teleconference on

9 behalf of the Counties of

Southern Illinois)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

I N D E X

WITNESS

DIRECT

CROSS

REDIRECT

RECROSS

(None)

EXHIBITS

MARKED

ADMITTED

(None)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

PROCEEDINGS

JUDGE ALBERS: By the authority vested in me by the Illinois Commerce Commission, I now call Docket Number 12-0094. This docket concerns the petition of the Counties of Southern Illinois for authority to operate a regional next generation 9-1-1 pilot project system.

May I have the appearances for the record, please, start here in Springfield?

MR. LUSTIG: Patrick, P-A-T-R-I-C-K, J. Lustig, L-U-S-T-I-G, 303 North Robinson Circle, Carbondale 62901.

JUDGE ALBERS: And you are here on behalf of?

MR. LUSTIG: CSI. I am the project manager for the Counties of Southern Illinois, also the 9-1-1 coordinator for Jackson County 9-1-1.

JUDGE ALBERS: All right. Any other attorneys wishing to enter appearances?

MR. HIRD: Richard W. Hird, H-I-R-D, 842 Louisiana, Lawrence, Kansas 66044, appearing on behalf of NG-911, Inc., which is a vendor.

JUDGE ALBERS: Right. Anyone else in

1 Springfield?

2 MR. SMITH: Kenneth E. Smith, 300 North Park
3 Avenue, Herrin, Illinois 62948, and I am the Chairman
4 of CSI and 9-1-1 Coordinator for Williamson County.

5 JUDGE ALBERS: Anyone over the phone then,
6 unless there is more -- okay.

7 MS. HERTEL: Appearing on the phone is Nancy
8 Hertel, H-E-R-T-E-L, appearing on behalf of AT&T
9 Illinois, 225 West Randolph, Chicago, Illinois 60606.

10 MS. ARMSTRONG: Appearing on behalf of Staff of
11 the Illinois Commerce Commission, Kelly Armstrong,
12 160 North LaSalle Street, Suite C-800, Chicago,
13 Illinois 60601.

14 MR. KELLY: And appearing on behalf of CSI,
15 John Kelly, 1804 North Naper Boulevard, Naperville,
16 Illinois 60563 on the telephone from Naperville.

17 JUDGE ALBERS: Any others? Let the record
18 show --

19 LIEUTENANT FELTY: Lieutenant Tracy Felty,
20 Harris County 911, One North Main, Harrisburg,
21 Illinois 62946, CSI Treasurer.

22 JUDGE ALBERS: Could you repeat your name,

1 please?

2 LIEUTENANT FELTY: Lieutenant Tracy, T-R-A-C-Y,
3 Felty, F as in Frank, E-L-T-Y.

4 JUDGE ALBERS: All right. Any others?

5 (No response.)

6 Let the record show no response.

7 As far as the status of our efforts,
8 the last time we met we anticipated some supplemental
9 testimony of some sort to support the petition for
10 forbearance. But on September 20 we received the
11 Motion to Withdraw the petition for forbearance. I
12 will just start it off this way. Does anybody have
13 any objection to that motion?

14 MS. ARMSTRONG: Staff has no objection to that
15 motion.

16 JUDGE ALBERS: Anyone else?

17 (No response.)

18 Hearing no objection, then we will
19 grant the motion.

20 Well then, looking at what we do have
21 on the record then, we do have the direct testimony
22 of CSI. That was submitted with the petition. Is it

1 the parties', Staff and Intervenor's, position that
2 they be able to file responsive testimony at this
3 point or?

4 MS. ARMSTRONG: Your Honor, this is Kelly
5 Armstrong on behalf of Staff. I spoke to Mr. Kelly
6 and Ms. Hertel yesterday about possibly setting a
7 schedule in this case, and we believe that -- it is
8 Staff's position that as a result of the fact that
9 CSI will be entering into a contract with a 9-1-1
10 service provider, that they will have to alter some
11 aspects of their plan. And in the interest of not
12 having to go back and offer further testimony once
13 that's done, we believe that CSI should update their
14 plan accordingly, and then we can set a schedule for
15 Staff and Intervenor testimony after that point.

16 JUDGE ALBERS: Okay. Well, before I hear from
17 CSI, how do you envision such an update occurring?
18 What exactly are you thinking of?

19 MS. ARMSTRONG: Well, the plan itself as it is
20 written now deals with CSI being their own service
21 provider, obviously contracting with a certified
22 service provider, and I understand currently in the

1 state of Illinois there is only one, and that is
2 NG-911, that that will change various aspects of
3 their plan.

4 So I am not sure how Your Honors would
5 like them to do it, if you want them to resubmit the
6 entire plan. As far as that particular filing, I am
7 not really sure what the best course of action would
8 be.

9 JUDGE ALBERS: Okay. That's what I was
10 wondering, if you had a particular procedural
11 mechanism in mind. I can see how going with a 9-1-1
12 service provider could affect certain aspects of the
13 plan they came in here with initially and why it
14 would be useful to have that update on the record
15 before we hear from Staff and Intervenors.

16 Does anybody have any thoughts on a
17 procedural mechanism before we weigh in? Have you
18 talked about it basically amongst yourselves?

19 MR. LUSTIG: Go ahead, John.

20 MR. KELLY: Yeah, Judge Albers, this is John
21 Kelly on behalf of CSI.

22 I guess my thought would be that we

1 would supplement the currently pending petition with
2 a contract with whichever certified service provider
3 CSI ultimately contracts with. As I understand it,
4 in the state of Illinois there are only three
5 certified service providers, AT&T, Frontier and now
6 NG-911. CSI has explored a service provider
7 relationship with both Frontier and NG-911, and is
8 currently in the process of negotiating that
9 contract.

10 Now, I am not exactly sure what
11 changes this will make in the CSI plan since the role
12 of the service provider is pretty well defined by
13 statute and by Commission rule. So I don't know why
14 the fact that we are contracting with a service
15 provider is going to change most of what Staff and
16 the Intervenors may reply to or respond to in the
17 pending petition and testimony, and I would be an
18 advocate of them going ahead and getting under way
19 with everything else and then when we file -- because
20 I don't know how long it is going to take to
21 negotiate this contract with the service provider and
22 I hate to see this grind to a halt while we negotiate

1 the contract.

2 So my suggestion would be that the
3 Intervenor and Staff provide responsive testimony to
4 all that has been filed, all the data requests that
5 they have obtained and the currently pending plan.
6 And if when the contract with the service provider is
7 filed, there are some additional data requests and/or
8 testimony necessary, I think we can deal with that
9 then. But I am just not sure how the contract with
10 the data provider is going to materially change
11 what's already pending.

12 MS. HERTEL: Your Honor, this is Nancy Hertel
13 from AT&T Illinois.

14 I disagree with what Mr. Kelly has
15 said. There was the testimony set forth in their
16 plan was all predicated -- it was, in my opinion,
17 very ambiguous in terms of some things because they
18 didn't know at that point who their 9-1-1 service
19 provider was going to be. So a lot of the discovery
20 was predicated on trying to get more information
21 about a plan that hadn't completely crystalized.

22 So to go back and try to respond to

1 testimony that was based on not knowing who that is,
2 it seems like a critical component of it. It seems
3 reasonable to expect that they would supplement their
4 testimony. Whether the contract is finalized or not,
5 they have a better idea and on how the CSI plan is
6 going to work, and I think it would put the
7 Intervenors and Staff in an awkward position if we
8 were to try to file reasonable and subsequent
9 testimony that we are just kind of saying, well, if
10 it works this way, then here is what we think.

11 So I would -- whether the contract is
12 finalized and formal, you know, formalized signed, I
13 still think it would be reasonable to expect that CSI
14 update its current filing to reflect this change.

15 MR. HIRD: Could I weigh in on behalf of
16 NG-911, Inc.?

17 JUDGE ALBERS: Yes.

18 MR. HIRD: I appreciate Ms. Hertel's comments.
19 I think I would tend to echo most of what Mr. Kelly
20 has just said, but I would add that when you think
21 about this, this is an application and a plan for a
22 pilot project. Changing to a service provider,

1 whether it is NG-911, Inc., or one of the others,
2 really doesn't change the fundamental aspect of what
3 we are doing here, and that's to authorize this pilot
4 project. The technology isn't going to change
5 because there is a service provider involved. The
6 manner of conducting the pilot project, you may have
7 a service provider in charge of certain things that
8 you didn't before, but the things that are going to
9 occur, the testing, you know, all the things in the
10 field that have to be done, none of that really is
11 affected by this.

12 I guess the final thing I would say
13 is, as the vendor in this project, we would very much
14 like to see the Commission go ahead and set an
15 aggressive schedule because I think we need to bring
16 this pilot project application to some sort of a
17 decision, and I hate to engage in another chapter
18 that's going to prolong this process.

19 JUDGE ALBERS: Any others before Judge Von
20 Qualen and I confer?

21 MR. SMITH: I would like to say that --

22 JUDGE ALBERS: Are you representing one of the

1 parties, though?

2 MR. SMITH: Ken Smith, Chairman of CSI.

3 JUDGE ALBERS: Are you counsel for one of the
4 parties?

5 MR. SMITH: No, not counsel.

6 JUDGE ALBERS: I think Mr. Kelly, I think, is
7 here for CSI.

8 MR. SMITH: Okay.

9 JUDGE ALBERS: All right.

10 MS. ARMSTRONG: Your Honor, I would just like
11 to further state Staff is not in a position of
12 wanting to delay this for any reason. We would like
13 to see this moving forward.

14 However, I don't want to be in a
15 position where Staff and the Intervenors file
16 testimony and then we have to go back through several
17 rounds of rebuttal and surrebuttal and additional
18 discovery because we are unclear about what is in the
19 plan.

20 I think Mr. Hird said so himself; the
21 plan is changing so that the service provider is
22 going to be in charge of some certain things, and at

1 this point it is not entirely clear by the filing
2 that's already been made by CSI what those certain
3 things are. And so I think that, in the interest of
4 not going back and forth through several rounds of
5 rebuttal, it may be in everyone's best interests to
6 move forward as quickly as possible in CSI looking at
7 their filing and making sure that it is clear as
8 possible and it does reflect what the service
9 provider will be doing and who the service provider
10 is, so that Staff and the Intervenors can evaluate
11 the whole plan as it will be implemented.

12 JUDGE ALBERS: All right. Thank you.

13 MR. HIRD: May I further respond, Your Honor?

14 JUDGE ALBERS: Go ahead.

15 MR. HIRD: I would say I appreciate what
16 Ms. Armstrong is saying. I do think that I just want
17 to reiterate that the plan really is the same. The
18 only thing that is changed is that NG-911, Inc.,
19 would theoretically, as long as we agree on a
20 contract, move its responsibility and role then from
21 that of purely a vendor to that of a service
22 provider.

1 If Your Honors are going to request
2 CSI to do some sort of supplemental filing, I hope
3 that it's an abbreviated version that we can explain
4 the difference in roles or the difference in how this
5 would impact the plan, rather than refile the whole
6 plan because then it kind of has the feeling that we
7 are starting from scratch then. I don't think
8 anybody wants that.

9 MS. HERTEL: This is Nancy Hertel from AT&T
10 Illinois. I mean, I am not suggesting that they
11 should re-docket it or something, but it would be
12 helpful, if they do file an amendment or something,
13 if some pieces of testimony are just unaltered, that
14 it would be clear which testimonies haven't been
15 updated and are updated so it would be very clear to
16 the parties in terms of when we respond what we are
17 responding to.

18 JUDGE ALBERS: All right.

19 MR. KELLY: If I can say on behalf of CSI, the
20 role of the service provider is defined by statute
21 and the rule. Whoever the service provider is, is
22 the only real question that I think CSI needs to

1 supplement the plan with. Because what the service
2 provider does, that's all defined by statute and
3 that's not going to change. It is what it is.

4 JUDGE ALBERS: Well, Judge Von Qualen and I
5 will step out for a minute and talk about what you
6 have all shared with us, and be back in a moment.

7 (Whereupon the hearing was in a
8 short recess.)

9 JUDGE ALBERS: Well, thank you for your
10 patience. Judge Von Qualen and I are in complete
11 agreement on this. While we have no intent to slow
12 the process down, we do believe it would be
13 appropriate to have some type of supplemental
14 supplement to the earlier revised petition because I
15 believe we currently have an amended petition before
16 us now. The other one, the original one, has been
17 replaced, if I recall correctly. So some type of
18 supplement to the previously amended petition.

19 It does not have to be an entire new
20 petition. What we do want to see up front is a list
21 of some sort of what has changed among any of the
22 documents that have already been filed so that we

1 know how the arrangement with NG-911 would affect
2 what's already been filed.

3 To the extent that there is some
4 aspect of one of the attachments or the amended
5 petition itself that has changed, you can just state
6 that in the supplemental filing. You don't have to
7 actually provide a new attachment or a new petition.

8 If any of the testimony would have
9 changed, then we would want to see revised testimony
10 or also a supplement to that individual's testimony
11 explaining that.

12 And if you think you can provide those
13 updates without having a finalized contract, that's
14 fine. But if you think you need to have a finalized
15 contract to fully spell out what is changing about
16 the earlier proposal, then so be it, and you have to
17 wait until you get your contract finalized and then
18 tell us what the changes are.

19 And I think we would then put the ball
20 back in your court, Mr. Kelly, in terms of how much
21 time you think you would want to provide that or if
22 you want to maybe talk to your client about how much

1 time -- or, I am sorry, talk to your client about
2 whether or not they need to have the contract
3 finalized. You can come back and let us know.

4 MR. KELLY: Well, Judge, if we don't have to
5 identify the particular vendor by name, then I think,
6 again, going back to my earlier point, that whatever
7 a certified service provider services they are going
8 to provide, we can define those services as long as
9 we don't have to name who the provider is which we
10 can't do until the contract is negotiated.

11 If that's okay, then I would say we
12 could have that done within 14 days easily. But if
13 the Intervenors or Staff are going to suggest that we
14 should have a named service provider, then I have no
15 idea.

16 JUDGE ALBERS: Well, that seems to suggest to
17 me that no matter which of the three providers it
18 would be, there wouldn't be any need for further
19 updates to your proposal. Is that what you are
20 telling me?

21 MR. KELLY: I don't think, no matter what the
22 provider is or who the provider is, that the role of

1 that provider is going to vary between providers. I
2 think, again, I think it is pretty well defined what
3 the role is. And if once the contract with the
4 service provider is negotiated, whoever that might
5 be, if others think it is appropriate that we then
6 file that contract as another supplemental exhibit to
7 the petition, we can consider that at that time. But
8 I think it is going to be a whole lot easier to
9 generically suggest the role of the service provider
10 in an amended -- or an amendment to the petition and
11 much more quicker to do that than to await the
12 negotiation of a contract.

13 MS. HERTEL: This is Nancy Hertel speaking on
14 behalf of one of the Intervenors.

15 It seems to me, you know, that there
16 may be very generic things that are the role of a
17 9-1-1 system provider and one would look to the code
18 and one would look to the administrative rules, but
19 there still may be details depending upon who the
20 provider they are using is.

21 So it seems to me very relevant
22 because we have gone through several rounds of, you

1 know, they have filed the petition, they didn't know
2 who it was going to be, and then they were seeking a
3 waiver from that, and so it is unclear until it is
4 clarified who the provider is going to be. It really
5 is hard to evaluate the plan and, to the extent that
6 the Intervenors have concerns, express those
7 concerns. So to me it seems relevant who the
8 provider is.

9 MS. ARMSTRONG: I would also echo the concerns
10 of Ms. Hertel. I believe that it would be necessary
11 to know who that provider is as well as have
12 information on the contract, and I think that that is
13 going to be something that, if we went forward now
14 just with a generic service provider assumed in the
15 role, I think that later on we are going to be coming
16 back and possibly Staff, possibly Intervenors will be
17 issuing data requests regarding the contract with the
18 service provider. And, again, that's just going back
19 to additional rounds of supplemental and additional
20 rounds of rebuttal testimony. And I just think in
21 the interest of not going back and doing this several
22 times, it may be better to wait.

1 JUDGE VON QUALEN: This is Judge Von Qualen.
2 And Judge Albers and I think that what we would like
3 to do is set this over for about three weeks. We
4 would like to give you, Mr. Kelly, two weeks to
5 provide your supplement, if you can, but with the
6 understanding that we have heard the concerns voiced
7 by Ms. Armstrong and Ms. Hertel. I think the parties
8 need to talk to each other and identify between each
9 other what exactly is going to change with this
10 having a contracted service provider rather than
11 having CSI 9-1-1 provide the service. If you can
12 talk to each other and determine what is going to
13 change, perhaps Intervenor and Staff will be
14 satisfied with a supplemental filing.

15 To the extent Staff and Intervenors
16 are not satisfied that a supplemental filing can be
17 made because of the contract or service provider, we
18 would appreciate you being able to articulate to us
19 exactly what your concerns are that cannot be
20 addressed now without knowing who the service
21 provider is going to be.

22 So that being said, what we would like

1 is in two weeks if the parties can agree that a
2 supplement will be sufficient, the supplement be
3 filed. If you cannot agree that a supplement will be
4 sufficient at this time until the contract is signed,
5 please make some kind of filing so that Judge Albers
6 and I know what the concerns are about a supplemental
7 without knowing who the contractor will be.

8 Is that clear?

9 MR. KELLY: Judge Von Qualen, you are
10 suggesting then that if the Intervenor, Staff and CSI
11 cannot come to a resolution, that Intervenor and
12 Staff then make that filing relative to their
13 concerns?

14 MS. VON QUALEN: Yes.

15 MS. HERTEL: And there would be no filing in
16 the interim by CSI?

17 MS. VON QUALEN: I don't see what the point
18 would be for a filing from CSI if Staff and
19 Intervenor already know they are going to object to
20 it.

21 MR. KELLY: What I am going to suggest is, from
22 CSI's perspective, we will prepare and circulate to

1 Staff and Intervenor a draft of what we believe the
2 necessary changes or amendments or revisions to the
3 amended petition are and then we can have a
4 discussion amongst us as to what their concerns would
5 be then with that draft. And we will do that within
6 14 days.

7 Then, you know, depending upon those
8 discussions, we can return to the position that the
9 Judge just stated.

10 JUDGE VON QUALEN: That sounds like a good
11 suggestion to Judge Albers and I. Shall we go ahead
12 and set another status hearing for three weeks or do
13 you think you will need more than one week after the
14 suggested draft amendment by CSI?

15 MS. HERTEL: I think AT&T would at least need a
16 little more time, and I don't know if -- I mean, the
17 date you have suggested, I don't know if Staff wants
18 to ask if we receive it in two weeks, like have a
19 workshop for the participants. You know, that would
20 perhaps -- maybe once we see it -- so if we had a
21 little more time after we see what they file and are
22 going to circulate to the parties and have some time

1 to take it up, I think maybe we need four weeks,
2 thinking that you would have a week to look at it,
3 possibly that time or even a conference call where
4 all the parties could talk. And then if we did need
5 to -- if Staff and Intervenors did need to submit, as
6 you suggested, something explaining why, you know,
7 this was incomplete information or deemed incomplete,
8 then we would need a little time. At least AT&T
9 Illinois would request a little time to do that.

10 MS. ARMSTRONG: Your Honor, I think we would
11 need more than a week. I think -- I hesitate to say
12 four weeks would be required.

13 MS. HERTEL: I didn't mean four after the two,
14 Kelly. I'm sorry to interrupt. But I meant two
15 after the two.

16 MS. ARMSTRONG: Okay. That's what I was
17 thinking as well. So I think we are in agreement
18 then that a status in four weeks would be okay.

19 JUDGE ALBERS: It sounds like you and
20 Ms. Hertel are in agreement. I don't know how CSI
21 and NG-911 feel about it.

22 MS. ARMSTRONG: I am sorry. I meant the two of

1 us are in agreement.

2 MR. HIRD: Mr. Kelly has a bigger dog in this
3 fight than I do, certainly.

4 MR. KELLY: Well, and I think the position of
5 CSI is clear; we would like to have it sooner rather
6 than later. But I am also not foolish enough to
7 believe that -- and have a status date if nothing
8 effective is going to be accomplished. So if
9 Intervenor and Staff are telling us they need two
10 weeks after we circulate the draft, so be it.

11 JUDGE ALBERS: Why don't we just suggest
12 Thursday, November 8, at 9:30 just as a starting
13 point?

14 MR. KELLY: That works for John Kelly from CSI.

15 MR. HIRD: For NG-911, Inc., that's fine, yes.

16 MS. HERTEL: It is fine for AT&T Illinois.

17 MS. ARMSTRONG: That date is fine for Staff.

18 JUDGE ALBERS: All right. Thank you. Any
19 other questions, comments, concerns? No?

20 MS. ARMSTRONG: Judge, just to be clear, so we
21 are saying that CSI's supplemental filing would be
22 two weeks from today and --

1 MR. KELLY: We are going to circulate it in
2 draft. I think that the Judges' direction was not to
3 file anything until at least we have some kind of
4 perhaps understanding of what you want and what we
5 don't have.

6 JUDGE ALBERS: I think our underlying concern
7 here is that -- and I don't mean to suggest this --
8 direct this to any particular individual or party,
9 but you guys need to talk. You all have legitimate
10 concerns, and I think rather than trying to talk past
11 each other in these status hearings, we need to have
12 you discuss this before we come here so we can
13 hopefully make better progress.

14 It sounds like Staff and AT&T have
15 some legitimate concerns about knowing what it is
16 that is being proposed. Yet, at the same time it
17 sounds like NG-911 and CSI both believe that not much
18 would change substantively. But, you know, Judge Von
19 Qualen and I, we can't tell ourselves just hearing
20 these arguments which one of you are more correct
21 than the other.

22 I mean, I am sure things will change

1 to some extent; it is just we don't know to what
2 degree. I hope if by talking to each other you can
3 come to better understand each other's positions, and
4 if you can clarify each other's positions, maybe in a
5 couple weeks or I guess two weeks plus whatever days
6 it takes to look at it, maybe we will get something
7 from CSI that is a supplemental document or
8 supplemental filing to the amended petition, and we
9 will all feel better about it and have a better
10 feeling of what is being proposed for the Commission
11 to consider, and we can go on and set a date for
12 testimony for Staff and Intervenors.

13 But if there are still going to be
14 underlying concerns or objections about what exactly
15 is being proposed, I am not sure it would do us any
16 good to set responsive testimony dates if it is not
17 clear what to respond to. So I am hoping that with a
18 little more time we can all come closer together at
19 least, have a better idea of where we disagree.

20 So I imagine -- it sounds like in a
21 couple of weeks CSI will circulate a draft to all the
22 parties setting forth what they think will change.

1 This will be informal, not officially filed. Staff
2 and Intervenors will take a look at that, get back
3 with CSI, and go from there. You know, if there are
4 problems, then we won't see anything from CSI, but we
5 will see something from Staff and Intervenors setting
6 forth their particular concerns. In any event, we
7 will meet back here on the 8th of November and see
8 where you folks are.

9 MR. KELLY: Your Honor, just for the record,
10 CSI will commit to circulating a draft by close of
11 business on Friday, October 19. So that then the
12 following week Intervenors and Staff can look at it
13 and hopefully we can have some sort of telephone
14 conference amongst us to resolve their questions and
15 any additional information that they may want.

16 MS. ARMSTRONG: Thanks, John.

17 JUDGE ALBERS: All right. I think that's a
18 good step. So anything else for today?

19 MR. HIRD: No, Your Honor.

20 JUDGE ALBERS: Well, thank you, everyone. I
21 wish you luck and we will meet again on November 8 at
22 9:30.

1 (Whereupon the hearing in this
2 matter was continued until
3 November 8, 2012, at 9:30 a.m.
4 in Springfield, Illinois.)
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22